Appl. No.: 10/711,439
Amdt. Dated: 10/6/2006
Reply to Office action of: 06/26/2006

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

There are no amendments to the drawings being presented herewith.

Appl. No.: 10/711,439
Amdt. Dated: 10/6/2006
Reply to Office action of: 06/26/2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Specification no amendments are presented herewith.

In the Drawings no amendments are presented herewith.

Claims 1 – 22 remain in this application. There being 22 claims not 21 currently pending in this application Applicant will response to the outstanding Examiner's action based on all 22 claims being rejected, not Claims 1 – 21. Once again the Examiner has not recognized that there are 22 claims currently pending in this application.

Claims 1 – 5, 13 – 15, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bejster et al (US 5,680,098). Specifically, the Examiner restates his basis of rejection of the Examiner's action dated 03/15/2006, namely:

> Regarding claims 1, the claimed a rear lighting system applied to an automotive vehicle, of the type comprising: at least one supporting element and a plurality of light sources assembled on the supporting element (the front lights 14 and rear lights 16, see Figs. 2 and 3, col. 2, lines 4 – 38); and a control means electrically connected to the light sources to actuate them such that the light sources can emit with at least two light intensity levels in order to carry ot at least two corresponding lighting functions, one of which consists of acting as brake lights (the controller 12, see Fig. 4, col. 1, lines 41 – 44 and col. 2, lines 11 – 38); and characterized in that the control means comprise detection means for detecting a malfunctioning of at least one of the light sources, and in that the control means are adapted to compensate for a corresponding variation in the total light intensity provided by the system due to the malfunctioning by means of actuating or deactivating at least another one of the light sources and/or increasing or decreasing the current to be made to circulate through at least the other light source or another different one (the when the current detector 48 senses a failure of a lamp, the processor 40 determines which adjacent lamp should be provide the function of the failed lamp, including changing duty cycle and intensity, see Fig. 4, col. 1, lines 44 – 49, col. 2, lines 51 – 67 and col. 3, lines 1 – 1 – 37).
>
> Regarding clam 2, the claimed a plurality of light sources are divided into a first group or main group, and a second

group or spare group, which are actuated by the control means to compensate for the malfunction of any of the light sources of the first group if necessary (the controller 12 with processor 40 to actuate any adjacent lamps to compensate for any of the failure lights 14 or 16, see Figs. 2 – 4, col. 1, lines 44 – 49, col. 2, lines 51 – 67 and col. 3, lines 1 – 1 – 37).

Regarding claim 3, all the claimed subject matters are cited in respect to claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 4, the claimed acting as anti-fog lights (the fog lamp 24, see Fig. 2).

Regarding claim 5, the claimed third lighting function consisting of acting as side lamps (the side lamps 50 and 52, see Fig. 4, col. 2, lines 44 – 48).

Regarding claim 13, all the claimed subject matters are cited in respect to claim 1 above, see Fig. 4.

Regarding claim 14, the claimed PWM technique (the PWM 44, see Fig. 4, col. 2, lines 44 – 63).

Regarding claim 15, the claimed brake lights (the brake lamps 34, see Fig. 3, col. 2, lines 32 – 38).

Regarding claim 19, all the claimed subject matters are cited in respect to claims 1 and 4 above.

Regarding claim 20, all the claimed subject matters are cited in respect to claim 4 above.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. The key to Applicant's invention is the ability to maintain the light intensity of a plurality of light sources even if one or more fail. This is accomplished by activating at least one additional light source for each failed light source and changing the light intensity of the assembly to maintain the desired overall light intensity level. In addition, there is no requirement that the plurality of light sources be paired with adjacent light sources or that only adjacent light sources may be activated and/or have light intensity level changes to compensate for a failed light source.

Appl. No.: 10/711,439
Amdt. Dated: 10/6/2006
Reply to Office action of: 06/26/2006

A fair reading of the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference discloses a method of using a pair of adjacent light sources to act as backup for each other (see for example, Col. 1, lines 38 – 49, and Col. 2, lines 51 – 55). Thus, if one of the pair fails the other adjacent light source of the pair is activated to perform the duties of the failed light source (see for example, Col. 2, line 52 – Col. 3, line 2). There is no teaching of the ability to activate or modify the light intensity of more than two paired light sources, nor is there any teaching or suggestion that this would be possible or desirable.

There is nothing in the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference which discloses, teaches or suggests to one skilled in the art how to modify the reference to provide for a plurality of light sources any of which may be substituted for a failed light source or to adjust the light intensity of more than one adjacent light source to allow for the overall system light intensity level to be maintained (see for example, Col. 29 – 37), to arrive at Applicant's claimed invention. Clearly there is no way one skilled in the art can arrive at Applicant's claimed invention from the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference without first having read Applicant's application.

The Examiner in his "Response to Arguments" clearly shows that he has confused the ability of a light source to perform different lighting functions, such as for example, high beam function or turn signal function, and the ability of any one of the light sources (bulbs) in a light array to take over the duties of any other failed light source (bulb) in said array without regard to whether there is a "paired" light source (bulb) available.

Clearly, when viewed in this light the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of multiple light sources to provide compensating for the loss of light intensity due to a failure of one light source, nor the ability of activating a second light source not adjacent to the failed first light source of Applicants' present invention eliminating the critical Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference elements of using paired adjacent light sources, and the lack of teaching of an array comprising a plurality of light sources all of which may be utilized to overcome light intensity loss due to one light source's failure.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) in view of Bruwer et al (US 6,828,739). Specifically, the Examiner restates his basis of rejection of the Examiner's action dated 03/15/2006, namely:

> Regarding claim 6, Bejster et al fails to disclose the light sources are LEDs. However, Bejster et al teaches that the

> front lights 14 and rear lights 16 are conventional light/bulb having to filaments, see Figs. 2 and 3, col. 1, lines 13 – 19). Bruwer et al suggest that two LEDs 18 and 20 are for use on the vehicle such as headlights, brake lights, tail lights, and so on, may take on any form comprising incandescent elements or filaments, halogen quartz units, discharge devices. Upon detecting failure of one of the light sources, the other light source will be actuated for compensating the failure light source, see Figs. 1 – 3, col. 1, lines 35 – 58 and col. 2, lines 12 – 18. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the LEDs light sources of Bruwer et al for the conventional light bulbs of Bejster et al because the light source can be taken in any form without limiting the operation functions of the light sources.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. The key to Applicant's invention, as mentioned above, is the ability to maintain the light intensity of a plurality of light sources even if one or more fail. This is accomplished by activating at least one additional light source for each failed light source and changing the light intensity of the assembly to maintain the desired overall light intensity level. In addition, there is no requirement that the plurality of light sources be paired with adjacent light sources or that only adjacent light sources may be activated and/or have light intensity level changes to compensate for a failed light source.

A fair reading of the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference, as mentioned above, discloses a method of using a pair of adjacent light sources to act as backup for each other (see for example, Col. 1, lines 38 – 49, and Col. 2, lines 51 – 55). Thus, if one of the pair fails the other adjacent light source of the pair is activated to perform the duties of the failed light source (see for example, Col. 2, line 52 – Col. 3, line 2). There is no teaching of the ability to activate or modify the light intensity of more than two paired light sources, nor is there any teaching or suggestion that this would be possible or desirable.

There is nothing in the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference which discloses, teaches or suggests to one skilled in the art how to modify the reference to provide for a plurality of light sources any of which may be substituted for a failed light source or to adjust the light intensity of more than one adjacent light source to allow for the overall system light intensity level to be maintained (see for example, Col. 29 – 37), to arrive at

Applicant's claimed invention. Clearly there is no way one skilled in the art can arrive at Applicant's claimed invention from the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference without first having read Applicant's application.

A fair reading of the Bruwer et al (US 6,828,739) reference discloses a system for providing a second light source to be activated upon failure of a first light source but again the teaching is directed only to paired light sources which are either sealed in a single globe or mounted together in a casing. This reference does teach that LEDs may be used for the paired light sources. However, the Bruwer et al (US 6,828,739) reference does not teach how to combine a plurality of LED light sources that may be activated in non-paired manner or of having more than one secondary light source light intensity level changed to compensate for the failure of a light source in the array.

The Examiner in his "Response to Arguments" clearly shows that he has confused the ability of a light source to perform different lighting functions, such as for example, high beam function or turn signal function, and the ability of any one of the light sources (bulbs) in a light array to take over the duties of any other failed light source (bulb) in said array without regard to whether there is a "paired" light source (bulb) available.

Clearly, when viewed in this light the Bruwer et al (US 6,828,739) reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of multiple light sources to provide compensating for the loss of light intensity due to a failure of one light source, nor the ability of activating a second light source not adjacent to the failed first light source as claimed in Applicants' present invention.

Furthermore, the Bruwer et al (US 6,828,739) reference is not combinable with the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference as the former teaches the use of two paired light sources in a single globe or casing and the later teaches the use of a pair of separately mounted light sources. Even if these two references were combinable they still fail to disclose, teach, or fairly suggest how to the use multiple light sources to provide compensating for the loss of light intensity due to a failure of one light source, or the ability of activating a second light source not adjacent to the failed first light source.

Clearly, when viewed in this light no combination of the Bruwer et al (US 6,828,739) and Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) references disclose, teach, or fairly suggest Applicant's claimed invention.

Appl. No.: 10/711,439
Amdt. Dated: 10/6/2006
Reply to Office action of: 06/26/2006

Claims 7 – 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bejster et al and Bruwer et al and further in view of Tillinghast et al (US 5,785,413). Specifically, the Examiner restates his basis of rejection of the Examiner's action dated 03/15/2006, namely:

> Regarding claim 7, Bejster et al fails to disclose supporting element is a rigid or flexible printed circuit and in that the LEDs are welded to electro-conducting tracks thereof. Bejster et al silences of the assembly the front lights 14 and rear lights 16 to the light case assembly, see Figs. 2 and 3. Tillinghast et al suggests that the light/lamp fixture 10 having control circuitry mounted on a common printed circuit board PC 12, which is fist in standardized light fixture openings utilized in some vehicle manufacture, see Figs. 1 – 3, col. 3, lines 21 – 27. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the PC of Tillinghast et al for mounting the front/rear lights or LEDs of Bejster et al and Bruwer et al since the PC is designed to fit in standardized light fixture in the vehicle.
>
> Regarding claim 8, Bejster et al fails to disclose the control means comprises an electronic system comprising at least one microprocessor associated to the detection means. However, Bejster et al teaches that the controller 12 has a processor 40, a memory 42, PWM 44, a multiplexer 46 and a current detector 48, see Fig. 4, col. 2, lines 39 – 45. Tillinghast et al suggests that the controller 44 as a microcontroller or a microprocessor is in communication with the trigger circuit 54, low intensity lamp switch means 50 and an external control circuit 43 to operate the vehicle light functions, see Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 11 – 28. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at time the invention was made to substitute the microprocessor of Tillinghast et al for the processor of Bejster et al and Bruwer et al since the processor has memory and multiplexer circuits and PWM integrated into a single chip to eliminate wires/cables, size and weight of the controller.
>
> Regarding claim 9, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between Bejster et al and Bruwer et al and

Tillinghast et al in respect to claim 8 above, see Figs. 2, 3 of Bejster et al and 1, 3 of Tillinghast et al.

Regarding claim 10, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between Bejster et al and Bruwer et al and Tillinghast et al in respect to claim 9 above.

Regarding claim 11, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between Bejster et al and Bruwer et al and Tillinghast et al in respect to claim 9 above.

Regarding claim 12, Bejster et al fails to disclose the electronic system forms part of a computer on board the vehicle. However, Bejster et al teaches that the external switch input 56 and indicator 58 such as dash light or an audible indicator is connected to the controller 12 with processor 40 to provide information to the vehicle operator as to the operation of the vehicle lamps 14 and 16, see Fig. 4, col. 2, lines 49 – 50 and col. 3, lines 12 – 28. Tillinghast et al suggests that the controller 44 as a microcontroller or a microprocessor is in communication with the trigger circuit 54, low intensity lamp switch means 50 and an external control circuit 43 as a simple microcontroller/microprocessor located at the driver's compartment, which allows a driver/user to operate the vehicle light functions, see Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 11 – 28, col. 5, lines 65 – 67 and col. 6, lines 1 – 14. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the external microcontroller of Tillinghast et al for the external switch and indicator of Bejster et al and Bruwer et al since the external microcomputer includes addresses for controlling each of the vehicle lighting system.

Regarding claim 18, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between Bejster et al and Bruwer et al and Tillinghast et al in respect to claims 12 and 15 above.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. The key to Applicant's invention, as mentioned above, is the ability to maintain the light intensity of a plurality of light sources even if one or more fail. This is accomplished by activating at least one additional light source for each failed light source and changing the light intensity of the

assembly to maintain the desired overall light intensity level. In addition, there is no requirement that the plurality of light sources be paired with adjacent light sources or that only adjacent light sources may be activated and/or have light intensity level changes to compensate for a failed light source.

A fair reading of the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference, as mentioned above, discloses a method of using a pair of adjacent light sources to act as backup for each other (see for example, Col. 1, lines 38 – 49, and Col. 2, lines 51 – 55). Thus, if one of the pair fails the other adjacent light source of the pair is activated to perform the duties of the failed light source (see for example, Col. 2, line 52 – Col. 3, line 2). There is no teaching of the ability to activate or modify the light intensity of more than two paired light sources, nor is there any teaching or suggestion that this would be possible or desirable.

A fair reading of the Bruwer et al (US 6,828,739) reference, as mentioned above, discloses a system for providing a second light source to be activated upon failure of a first light source but again the teaching is directed only to paired light sources which are either sealed in a single globe or mounted together in a casing. This reference does teach that LEDs may be used for the paired light sources. However, the Bruwer et al (US 6,828,739) reference does not teach how to combine a plurality of LED light sources that may be activated in non-paired manner or of having more than one secondary light source light intensity level changed to compensate for the failure of a light source in the array.

As pointed out above, the Examiner in his "Response to Arguments" clearly shows that he has confused the ability of a light source to perform different lighting functions, such as for example, high beam function or turn signal function, and the ability of any one of the light sources (bulbs) in a light array to take over the duties of any other failed light source (bulb) in said array without regard to whether there is a "paired" light source (bulb) available.

A fair reading of the Tillinghast et al (US 5,785,413) reference discloses a light fixture combining a regular light source and a strobe light source in a single housing and being able to utilize a single light reflector for use in emergency vehicles (see for example, Col. 3, lines 17 – 20, Col. 3, lines 31 – 35, and Figures 1 – 3). In addition, because the voltages needed to activate and maintain light emission in a strobe light source there is a need for electronics within the light source housing to prevent high

voltage traveling through the vehicles wiring harnesses as well as preventing RFI emissions (see for example, Col. 2, lines 34 – 44).Furthermore,in order to provide the necessary visual warning effects there is required circuitry to control the pulsing of the strobe light source and the lighting of the incandescent light source so the human eye perceives only the strobe light source (see for example, Col. 1, line 34 – Col. 2, line 3). The Tillinghast et al (US 5,785,413) reference does not disclose, teach, or fairly suggest how to utilize any second light source to compensate for the failure of any first light source.

Furthermore, there is no required impetus within Tillinghast et al (US 5,785,413) reference to suggest that it can be combined with a reference that is directed to compensating for a light source failure or how to achieve such compensation. Thus, this reference is not combinable with the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference or the Bruwer et al (US 6,828,739) reference or any combination of these without first having read Applicant's application.

Clearly, when viewed in this light the Tillinghast et al (US 5,785,413) reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of multiple light sources to provide compensating for the loss of light intensity due to a failure of one light source, nor the ability of activating a second light source not adjacent to the failed first light source as claimed in Applicants' present invention. Also, clearly, there is also not to be found the necessary impetus to suggest to one skilled in the art the desirability of combining the Tillinghast et al (US 5,785,413) reference with the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference or the Bruwer et al (US 6,828,739) reference.

Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) in view of Freeman et al (US 5,231,373). Specifically, the Examiner restates his basis of rejection of the Examiner's action dated 03/15/2006, namely:

> Regarding claim 16, Bejster et al fails to disclose the sudden speed reduction of the vehicle is detected by means of an accelerometer included in the system. However, Bejster et al teaches that the controller 12 operates a brake lamp 34 operate when the brake pedal of the vehicle is being depressed, see Fig. 3, col. 2, lines 32 – 33. The rear turn lamp 32 or rear park lamp 30 would also acts as a brake lamp function when the brake lamp 34 is failure,, see

> Figs. 3 and 4, col. 4, lines 8 – 11. Freeman et al suggests that a vehicular illumination control system 10 automatically controls intensity of a signal light source, center mounted brake signal SL, brake lights 14L, 14R, a sudden deceleration and/or light level due to depress of a brake pedal 12 and sensed by an accelerometer sensor as a G-force 16, see Figs. 1 and 2, lines 13 – 28 and col. 4, lines 36 – 68. Therefore, It would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the accelerometer sensor of Freeman et al to the controller of Bejster et al for automatically illuminate the brake lights due to suddenly deceleration caused by brake pedal, accident, tilting road and/or road conditions in order to early warning of following vehicles and to prevent of collision.
>
> Regarding claim 17, all the claimed subject matters are discussed between Bejster et al and Freeman et al in respect to claim 16 above, and the inclinometer (G-force sensor 16).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. The key to Applicant's invention, as mentioned above, is the ability to maintain the light intensity of a plurality of light sources even if one or more fail. This is accomplished by activating at least one additional light source for each failed light source and changing the light intensity of the assembly to maintain the desired overall light intensity level. In addition, there is no requirement that the plurality of light sources be paired with adjacent light sources or that only adjacent light sources may be activated and/or have light intensity level changes to compensate for a failed light source.

A fair reading of the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference, as mentioned above, discloses a method of using a pair of adjacent light sources to act as backup for each other (see for example, Col. 1, lines 38 – 49, and Col. 2, lines 51 – 55). Thus, if one of the pair fails the other adjacent light source of the pair is activated to perform the duties of the failed light source (see for example, Col. 2, line 52 – Col. 3, line 2). There is no teaching of the ability to activate or modify the light intensity of more than two paired light sources, nor is there any teaching or suggestion that this would be possible or desirable.

Appl. No.: 10/711,439
Amdt. Dated: 10/6/2006
Reply to Office action of: 06/26/2006

As pointed out above, the Examiner in his "Response to Arguments" clearly shows that he has confused the ability of a light source to perform different lighting functions, such as for example, high beam function or turn signal function, and the ability of any one of the light sources (bulbs) in a light array to take over the duties of any other failed light source (bulb) in said array without regard to whether there is a "paired" light source (bulb) available.

A fair reading of the Freeman et al (US 5,231,373) reference discloses an improved illumination control system for vehicular use which automatically controls the intensity of illumination provided by a signal light as a function of change in a parameter affecting safety (see for example, Col. 3, lines 25 – 66) using an electronic control system to achieve this (see for example, Col. 3, line 67 – Col. 4, line 19). The use of sensors including light sensors, fog sensors, and precipitation sensors (see for example, Col. 7, line 43 – Col 8. line 4) as well as an accelerometer (see for example, Col. 6, lines 32 – 41). The Freeman et al (US 5,231,373) reference does not disclose, teach, or fairly suggest how to utilize any second light source to compensate for the failure of any first light source.

Furthermore, there is not the required impetus within Freeman et al (US 5,231,373) reference to suggest that it can be combined with a reference that is directed to compensating for a light source failure or how to achieve such compensation. Thus, this reference is not combinable with the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference without first having read Applicant's application.

Clearly, when viewed in this light the Freeman et al (US 5,231,373) reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of multiple light sources to provide compensating for the loss of light intensity due to a failure of one light source, nor the ability of activating a second light source not adjacent to the failed first light source as claimed in Applicants' present invention. Also, clearly, there is also not to be found the necessary impetus to suggest to one skilled in the art the desirability of combining the Freeman et al (US 5,231,373) reference with the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) in view of Okubo et al (US 6,969,183). Specifically, the Examiner restates his basis of rejection of the Examiner's action dated 03/15/2006, namely:

> Regarding claim 6, Bejster et al fails to disclose the fog sensor device comprises at least one humidity sensor and

> one temperature sensor. However, Bejster et al teaches that a controller 12 controls to actuate a fog lamp 24 is actuated due to fog conditions, see Fig. 2, col. 2, lines 7 – 10. Okubo et al suggests that a digital lighting system for a vehicle comprising a controller 6 coupled to an environmental detector 5 for determining whether it is foggy based on at least one of the image signal obtained by imaging the information on surroundings of the vehicle by the imaging device of the surrounding environmental detector 5 and output from the imaging device, the radar signal obtained by detecting the reflected wave from the target in the surroundings of the vehicle by the radar of the surrounding environment detector 5 and output from the radar, the humidity signal obtained by detecting the humidity of the surroundings of the vehicle by the humidity sensor of the surrounding environment detector 5 and output from the humidity sensor, andthetemperature signal obtained by detecting the temperature of the surroundings of the vehicle by the temperature sensor of the surrounding environment detector 5 and output from the temperature sensor, and outputs a signal indicating that it is foggy or a signal indicating that it is not foggy, see Figs. 1, 14, 15 and 18, col. 2, lines 49 – 67, col. 3, lines 1 – 23 and col. 17, lines 23 – 30. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the humidity and temperature environmental detector of Okubo et al to the controller of Bejster et al for improving the reliability of the vehicle lighting system by automatically detecting the foggy conditions to actuate the fog lamp for helping a driver visibility to prevent incident.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. The key to Applicant's invention, as mentioned above, is the ability to maintain the light intensity of a plurality of light sources even if one or more fail. This is accomplished by activating at least one additional light source for each failed light source and changing the light intensity of the assembly to maintain the desired overall light intensity level. In addition, there is no requirement that the plurality of light sources be paired with adjacent light sources or that only adjacent light sources may be activated and/or have light intensity level changes to compensate for a failed light source.

A fair reading of the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference, as mentioned above, discloses a method of using a pair of adjacent light sources to act as backup for each

other (see for example, Col. 1, lines 38 – 49, and Col. 2, lines 51 – 55). Thus, if one of the pair fails the other adjacent light source of the pair is activated to perform the duties of the failed light source (see for example, Col. 2, line 52 – Col. 3, line 2). There is no teaching of the ability to activate or modify the light intensity of more than two paired light sources, nor is there any teaching or suggestion that this would be possible or desirable.

A fair reading of the Okubo et al (US 6,969,183) reference discloses a digital lighting apparatus for use in changing the light pattern and light intensity of vehicle headlamps to meet varying climatic and geographic environments outside the vehicle (see for example, Fig. 12, Abstract, Col. 7, lines 32 – 42). In this regard the reference teaches the use of sensors to detect said climatic environments including the use of sensors to recognize fog conditions (see for example, Col. 12, lines 22 – 48). The Okubo et al (US 6,969,183) reference does not disclose, teach, or fairly suggest any manner of using a plurality or even a pair of light sources such that when one fails the other is activated or has its light intensity changed to compensate for the failed light source. Furthermore, there is not the required impetus to suggest to one skilled in the art that the use of environmental sensors to adjust headlight lighting pattern to combine the sensors with a paired set of light sources to provide proper light intensity when one of the pair of light sources fails as taught by the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference. And even if these references were combinable, which they are not, they do not disclose, teach, or fairly suggest the use of multiple light sources to provide compensating for the loss of light intensity due to a failure of one light source, nor the ability of activating a second light source not adjacent to the failed first light source as claimed in Applicants' present invention. Instead, as pointed out above, the Examiner in his "Response to Arguments" clearly shows that he has confused the ability of a light source to perform different lighting functions, such as for example, high beam function or turn signal function, and the ability of any one of the light sources (bulbs) in a light array to take over the duties of any other failed light source (bulb) in said array without regard to whether there is a "paired" light source (bulb) available. Thus clearly, there is not the required impetus within either the Okubo et al (US6,969,183) reference or the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference to suggest that it can be combined with a reference that is directed to compensating for a light source failure or how to achieve such compensation.

Appl. No.: 10/711,439
Amdt. Dated: 10/6/2006
Reply to Office action of: 06/26/2006

Clearly, when viewed in this light the Okubo et al (US 6,969,183) reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of multiple light sources to provide compensating for the loss of light intensity due to a failure of one light source, nor the ability of activating a second light source not adjacent to the failed first light source as claimed in Applicants' present invention. Also, clearly, there is also not to be found the necessary impetus to suggest to one skilled in the art the desirability of combining the Okubo et al (US 6,969,183) reference with the Bejster et al (US 5,680,098) reference.

Applicant notes the reference cited by the Examiner but not used as a basis of rejection. In view of this reference not being a basis of rejection, Applicant makes no further comment about it.

In view of the remarks herein, and the amendments hereto, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and such action and issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce E. Harang

Bruce E. Harang
Registration No. 29,720
Tel.: (360) 903-4693